

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

16 KATHLEEN MARIE POWELL,

O R D E R
Civ. No. 10-923-TC

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,

20 Defendant.
21


22 AIKEN, Chief Judge:

23 Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and
24 Recommendation on September 23, 2011. The matter is now before
25 me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P.
26 72(b). When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's
27 Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de
28 novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report.

1 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore
2 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.
3 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

4 Plaintiff has timely filed objections concerning the weight
5 afforded to Dr. Bryan's opinion, the improper consideration of
6 lay testimony, and failure to develop the record. I have,
7 therefore, given those portions of the report a de novo review.
8 I agree with Magistrate Judge Coffin's analysis and conclusion
9 and therefore ADOPT the Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation
10 (doc. 17) in its entirety. In conclusion, the Administrative Law
11 Judge's decision is reversed and remanded in part, to award
12 benefits as of plaintiff's 55th birthday, and otherwise affirmed.
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated this 10th day of January 2012.

15
16
17
18 
19 Ann Aiken
United States District Judge